



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/584,477      | 06/01/00    | SKLAR                | R 071815/0478       |

WM21/0215  
KYLE EPPELE  
ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
400 COLLINS ROAD ROAD NE M S 124 323  
CEDAR RAPIDS IA 52498

EXAMINER

GRANT, C

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2611

4

DATE MAILED: 02/15/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/584,477

Applicant(s)  
SKLAR et al.

Examiner  
Christopher Grant

Group Art Unit  
2611



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher Grant (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Phillip Articola (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Feb 13, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:  
none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

On 2/7/2001, Mr. Articola informed the examiner that (1) form 1449 was not received and (2) the office action is the same as the office action in the parent application which was allowed. On 2/13/2001 the examiner (1) faxed a copy of form 1449 which should have been sent with the office action and (2) informed applicant that in a re-issue application all claims are examined and that there is no presumption of validity attached to the claims which were previously issued in the parent application. As a result, a rejection over existing art of record can be applied.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

CHRISTOPHER GRANT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2611

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.